

### Unresolved Problem

September 20th, 2002

By Neil Cavuto

#### THE O'REILLY FACTOR

CAVUTO: In the second "Unresolved Problem" Segment, no longer a matter of if but when. That is the read on Iraq these days. We're going after them, and maybe sooner than you think, that despite some disparaging comments from the Germans and lots of grief from the U.N. Yet even there, some are dropping into line. What happened?

Let's ask Illinois Congresswoman Janice Schakowsky, a Democrat who joins us now from Chicago, and, from Columbia, South Carolina, Congressman Joe Wilson, a Republican.

Congresswoman, to you first. Are you for an attack on Iraq? REP. JANICE SCHAKOWSKY (D), ILLINOIS: I'm not, and I represent the views of my constituents. I have yet to find someone who thinks that a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq is a good idea.

CAVUTO: So, if this resolution came to a vote, Congresswoman, you would say no?

SCHAKOWSKY: I'm voting no, and I hope that the resolution as written by the White House is going to be changed significantly to talk about inviting the U.N. -- that we'll work with the U.N. in this effort.

CAVUTO: All right. Now, before I get to the congressman, Congresswoman, do you know how many others share your views? I mean, if it came to a vote right now, how many would...

SCHAKOWSKY: Well, I certainly saw a lot of talk on the floor of the House, in every segment of the Democratic caucus from the most conservative to the most progressive, concerns about this notion of preemptive strikes, of unilateral action, and what it's going to do to our war on terrorism. This is a diversion. This is a serious diversion.

CAVUTO: OK. So you don't know -- you don't know how many, but you say there's a number that agree with you?

SCHAKOWSKY: Yes. Yes.

CAVUTO: OK.

Congressman, if you had to make a call right now, how many would vote for this?

REP. JOE WILSON (R), SOUTH CAROLINA: I disagree very much with what the

congresswoman said. I believe that the president made -- has made an excellent case, and what this is is self-defense. There's no question.

We have a new Hitler who has access to weapons of mass destruction which could be used against the people of the United States just as we had an attack on September the 11th, 2001, and so we need to act in self- defense.

And I believe that many Democrats have actually come on board. I was very encouraged to read in "The Washington Post" today, which is not a pro- Bush newspaper, that there is a coming together of many Democrats, not all, as we just heard.

But many Democrats are coming on board recognizing that Saddam Hussein is a threat to world peace and a threat to the people of the United States.

CAVUTO: All right.

SCHAKOWSKY: Congressman, I think you've been in briefings, as I have, and there is no imminent threat right now from Saddam Hussein. No one has...

CAVUTO: Well, what do you need to...

WILSON: It is...

CAVUTO: What do...

WILSON: There is an imminent threat.

CAVUTO: Congresswoman, what do you -- what do you need to see, Congresswoman.

SCHAKOWSKY: I'll tell you what. What we need to see is that we do have an imminent threat from al Qaeda, from Usama bin Laden, and to divert our attention from that threat...

WILSON: This is not...

SCHAKOWSKY: ... to go...

WILSON: This is...

SCHAKOWSKY: ... into Iraq...

WILSON: This is all...

SCHAKOWSKY: ... alone at this time...

WILSON: This -- that is so wrong. This is all one seamless group of people who are supporting each other, harboring each other, and we have a dictator who...

SCHAKOWSKY: And that is not true either.

WILSON: ... is promoting the development...

SCHAKOWSKY: There has been no connection.

CAVUTO: One at a time.

WILSON: ... of chemical and biological weapons.

CAVUTO: Congressman, let me ask you then. You know, there is a legitimate beef here expressed by some Republicans and a lot of Democrats that the president hasn't made a compelling case to prove the dots connect and that they go back to Saddam Hussein.

WILSON: Well, I think they will, and I think, as indicated, again, in "The Washington Post," who would ever dream they would write a favorable article about George W. Bush? But it pointed out that he's made the case.

The vice president, Secretary Rumsfeld, the Secretary of State Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice -- all have done a wonderful job of making the case that's been convincing to everyone who has an open mind and who's concerned about the people of the United States.

I'm concerned. I don't want any more attacks. Two weeks ago, I was at ground zero. I don't want to go back to another ground zero.

CAVUTO: Well, guys, the fact of the matter...

SCHAKOWSKY: You know...

CAVUTO: Here's how -- Congressman, maybe you can help me with this, but here's how I see it. This is going to pass. This is going to pass overwhelmingly. It's going to be overwhelmingly accepted. We're even going to probably get a couple of more of our European partners on board with this, not like we did for the Gulf War.

So, Congresswoman, you're in a situation now where you're on record voting against American men and women going into battle. How's that going to look?

SCHAKOWSKY: I think what we're going to find is that the president is setting a very dangerous precedent. This notion of preemptive strikes, which is the new Bush doctrine, is a very contagious one. I don't think it makes the world safer. I think it makes it more dangerous. I do think...

CAVUTO: Well, if you knew Usama bin Laden was a nasty character and you had a chance to...

SCHAKOWSKY: Well, of course.

CAVUTO: ... to preemptively take him out, knowing what you do now, would you have taken him out? Would you have approved of a preemptive strike against...

SCHAKOWSKY: I think...

CAVUTO: ... the mountains of Afghanistan to go after the guy?

SCHAKOWSKY: I think what you're going to find with Saddam Hussein is that he does have chemical and biological weapons that he can use immediately against Israel. There will be a response, and we're going to see that region of the world in flames.

I am not for doing nothing. I think coercive inspections, along with our allies, where we go and we find out...

CAVUTO: But, Congresswoman, our allies -- our allies have done squat when it comes to this problem. They've abandoned the need to even recognize it.

SCHAKOWSKY: You know...

CAVUTO: So how can you support what they're doing when they've done nothing?

SCHAKOWSKY: I'll tell you why, because the president can't take yes for an answer. He went to the United Nations. There has been a response. I think they will take these resolutions seriously. I think they are serious now about coercive inspections, full inspections. That's the route we should go. We should...

CAVUTO: Let's hope you're right.

But, Congressman, the history seems to be thus far that every time -- it's like me with diets. You know, I keep saying I'm going to go on one, and I never do. So I'm worried about Saddam Hussein, and this is with respect to both of you, whether now he's saying, "All right. Bring the inspectors in," and he's going to kick them out again, like me in a bake shop. I'm going to start eating again.

SCHAKOWSKY: And then we go back to the drawing boards. But to say that we won't even work with our allies, that the United States says it's my way or the highway...

CAVUTO: Congressman, what do you think of that?

WILSON: The Congresswoman is absolutely wrong. We are working with our allies, and we have a risk here to the American people. We have a risk of chemical and biological weapons being used against our citizens in this country.

We have a risk of a madman, a new Hitler, developing nuclear weapons which could be used against the American people. We are the target. The rest of the count -- the rest of the world is not the target.

CAVUTO: But, Congressman, the congresswoman raises a good point.

WILSON: America...

CAVUTO: The Congresswoman raises a very good point about what happens once we're in there and the wrath that it ensues from other Middle Eastern countries. Are we ready to accept the long-term pain of this short-term gain?

WILSON: And -- no, this isn't short-term. This is protecting the American people, and this -- these same arguments were used as we went back against Saddam Hussein back in 1991, and all of the arguments were false. They were fake then. They're fake now.

But, even worse, America is under attack. We've been attacked since 1993. We need to...

SCHAKOWSKY: Exactly. And we...

CAVUTO: Congresswoman, let me ask you -- let me ask you...

SCHAKOWSKY: Yes.

CAVUTO: All right. Let's say this resolution passes overwhelmingly, as I suspect it probably will, and our boys and girls are in battle. Will you stand by the president?

SCHAKOWSKY: We're going to send thousands -- hundreds of thousands of young men and women into harm's way when we don't need to do that by ourselves.

CAVUTO: I'm asking you, if it happens, will you go -- are you going to stand by the president...

SCHAKOWSKY: Will I support...

CAVUTO: ... or not.

SCHAKOWSKY: Will I support our troops? Will I support those young men and women? You bet I will. What I'm trying to do -- I'm trying to do that right now, to prevent their having to go there and to bring more peace to the world, not make it...

WILSON: Well, I disagree. I think...

SCHAKOWSKY: ... more dangerous.

WILSON: ... that we're risking millions of American lives, if we don't act, and I have three sons in the military. I care about this. And we need to act to defend the American people.

CAVUTO: OK.

SCHAKOWSKY: It's the military...

CAVUTO: All right, guys.

SCHAKOWSKY: ... people who are most vulnerable.

CAVUTO: That's it. That's it. You can keep talking off the air if you want. But thank you very much for clearly expressing your views. Congressman Wilson. Congresswoman Schakowsky. Thank you very much.

Up next, a kinder gentler David Caruso? The former "NYPD Blues" star is back, but what about that famous temper? Is that back? You might be very surprised. Caruso with Cavuto. It's like an Italian dinner hour. Next.